$SU(5)$ Octet Scalar at the LHC

S. Khalil[1,2], S. Salem[1,3], M. Allam[3]
[1] *Center for Theoretical Physics, Zewail City for Science and Technology, 6 October City, Cairo, Egypt.*
[2] *Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.*
[3] *Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Al Azhar University, Cairo, Egypt.*

Color scalars are salient features of non-minimal $SU(5)$ model, where the Higgs sector is extended by 45-dimensional multiplet. We show that the gauge coupling unification can be realized in this model with TeV octet scalars and intermediate scale ($\sim 10^8$ GeV) color-triplet scalars at 10^{16} GeV. We also analyze possible LHC signatures of these TeV octet scalars. We show that multi-(b)-jet final states provide significant signal for a direct probe of the octet scalars at the LHC.

arXiv:1401.1482v2 [hep-ph] 22 Jun 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The major goal of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) experiments at CERN is to probe new physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) at TeV energy scales. The grand unified theory based on $SU(5)$ gauge symmetry is one of the most appealing scenarios for possible extension of the SM. The minimal $SU(5)$ accommodates the matter fields in 5^* and 10 dimensional representations, while the scalar sector consists of 24 and 5 dimensional Higgs multiplets [1].

However, minimal $SU(5)$ suffers from several severe problems. For instance, it does not seem to unify the SM gauge couplings. In addition, it predicts wrong fermion mass relations: $m_{\mu(e)} = m_{s(d)}$ that contradict the experiment measurements. A possible approach to overcome some of these problems, is to introduce an extra Higgs multiplet with 45_H dimensional representation [2–4]. The 45_H transforms under the SM gauge as

$$45_H = (8,2,1/2) \oplus (1,2,1/2) \oplus (3,1,-1/3) \oplus (3,3,-1/3) \oplus (6^*,1,-1/3) \oplus (3^*,2,-7/6) \oplus (3^*,1,4/3). \quad (1)$$

It also satisfies the following constraints: $45^{\alpha\beta}_{\gamma} = -45^{\beta\alpha}_{\gamma}$ and $\sum_{\alpha}^{5}(45)^{\alpha\beta}_{\alpha} = 0$. Thus, the electroweak symmetry $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ can be spontaneously broken into $U(1)_{em}$ through non-vanishing Vacuum Expectation Values (VEVs) of 5_H and 45_H, namely

$$\langle 5_H \rangle = v_5, \qquad \langle 45_H \rangle^{15}_1 = \langle 45_H \rangle^{25}_2 = \langle 45_H \rangle^{35}_3 = v_{45}, \qquad \langle 45_H \rangle^{45}_4 = -3v_{45}. \quad (2)$$

The 45_H-doublet is defined as in [3]

$$D^a \equiv (1,2)_{1/2} = \delta^c_b (45)^{ab}_c = -\delta^i_j (45)^{ai}_j \equiv \begin{pmatrix} D^+ \\ D^0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

While, 45_H-color octet scalars are given by [4]

$$S^{ia}_j \equiv (8,2)_{1/2} = (45_H)^{ia}_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta^i_j (45_H)^{ma}_m = \begin{pmatrix} S^+ \\ S^0_R + iS^0_I \end{pmatrix} \equiv S^A T^A, \quad (3)$$

where $i,j = 1,2,3$, $A = 1,..,8$, and T^A are the $SU(3)$ generators. It is clear that the octet scalars are defined as such that they have vanishing VEVs. Moreover, one can define the other components of the 45_H as follows:

$$(6^*,1,-1/3) \equiv \phi_{lk} = \epsilon_{lij} 45^{ij}_k, \quad (4)$$
$$(3^*,2,-7/6) \equiv \phi_{lc} = \epsilon_{lij} 45^{ij}_c, \quad (5)$$
$$(3^*,1,4/3) \equiv \phi_k = \epsilon_{ab} 45^{ab}_k, \quad (6)$$
$$(3,1,-1/3) \equiv T^i_1 = \delta^c_b 45^{ib}_c = -\delta^k_j 45^{ij}_k, \quad (7)$$
$$(3,3,-1/3) \equiv T^i_3 = 45^{ib}_c - \frac{1}{2}\delta^b_c 45^{id}_d. \quad (8)$$

These scalars acquire masses from the potential $V(5_H, 24_H, 45_H)$ after breaking the $SU(5)$ into $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ through the VEV of 24_H and the electroweak symmetry through the VEV of the doublets of 5_H and 45_H. Therefore, some of them could be light if one considers a possible fine tuning similar to the famous doublet-triplet splitting in 5_H [5]. We will assume that the scalars S_j^{ia}, D^a, and T_3^i are light with masses of order TeV, while the rest of the 45- scalars are superheavy [4]; *i.e.*, their masses are of order $\langle 24_H \rangle$ that breaks $SU(5)$ to SM at GUT scale. It is worth noting that in our model [3] light triplet T_3^i does not contribute to the proton decay since it has no coupling with QQ [7], due to the assumption of a symmetric Yukawa coupling for the interaction: (10 10 45) .

The aim of this article is twofold. Firstly, to show how modifying the particle content in the effective SU(5) theory realize the gauge couplings unification at 10^{16} GeV, that meets the theoretical predictions of the GUT energy scale [8]. Secondly, to study possible signature of the light colored scalars at the LHC. The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we study the gauge coupling unification in this class of models. Section 3 is devoted to direct searches for (neutral and charged) octet scalars at the LHC. Finally, we give our conclusions in section 4.

II. GAUGE COUPLING UNIFICATION

In quantum field theory, gauge couplings are functions of the energy at which they are measured and their Renormalization Group Equations (RGE), at one loop, are given by

$$\frac{d\alpha_i(t)}{dt} = \frac{b_i}{2\pi}\alpha_i^2(t), \qquad i = 1, 2, 3 \tag{9}$$

where $t = \ln \mu$ with μ is the running scale from the Electroweak scale, μ_Z, up to the scale of grand unification theory, $\mu_{\rm GUT}$. The couplings α_i are defined as $\alpha_i(t) = \frac{g_i^2(t)}{4\pi}$ and the $U(1)_Y$ coupling α_1 is normalized by the factor 5/3. One can solve these RGEs to obtain $\alpha_i(\mu)$ at a scale μ for given $\alpha_i(\mu_0)$,

$$\alpha_i(\mu)^{-1} = \alpha_i(\mu_0)^{-1} - \frac{b_i}{2\pi}\ln(\frac{\mu}{\mu_0}). \tag{10}$$

The one loop coefficients b_i are defined as

$$b = -\frac{11}{3}T_G(R) + \frac{2}{3}T_F(R) + \frac{1}{3}T_B(R), \tag{11}$$

where G, F, B stand for gauge bosons, fermions and bosons respectively. The Dynkin index $T(R)$ is defined for a representation R as $T(R)\delta_{ab} = Tr(T_a T_b)$, where T_a are the generators of this representation. In $SU(N)$, $T(\text{vector}) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $T(\text{adjoint}) = N$. Therefore, the b_i in the SM are given by

$$b_1^{\rm SM} = \frac{41}{10}, \quad b_2^{\rm SM} = -\frac{19}{6}, \quad b_3^{\rm SM} = -7. \tag{12}$$

In this case, one can easily show that using the experimental values of the coupling constants at electroweak scale: $\alpha_{em}^{-1} = 127.9, \sin^2\theta_W = 0.2329$ and $\alpha_3 = 0.110$, the three coupling constants will never meet at single point.

If one assumes that the mass of $SU(5)$-Higgs doublet is of order $\mu_Z \sim \mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV, while the octet scalar masses are of order $\mu_S \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV and the triplet scalar masses are of order $\mu_T \gg \mu_S$, then the following three regions for gauge coupling evolution are obtained: From μ_Z to μ_S, from μ_S to μ_T and from μ_T to $\mu_{\rm GUT}$. In these regions the one loop b_i- coefficients are given by

$$b_i^{\rm EW} = \left(\frac{21}{5}, -3, -7\right), \quad b_i^S = \left(5, -\frac{5}{3}, -5\right), \quad b_i^T = \left(\frac{26}{5}, \frac{1}{3}, -\frac{9}{5}\right). \tag{13}$$

Therefore the RGE solution in Eq. (10) takes the form

$$\alpha_i^{-1}(\mu_Z) = \alpha_{_{GUT}}^{-1} - \frac{b_i^{_{EW}}}{2\pi}\ln\left(\frac{\mu_S}{\mu_Z}\right) + \frac{b_i^{_S}}{2\pi}\ln\left(\frac{\mu_T}{\mu_S}\right) + \frac{b_i^{^T}}{2\pi}\ln\left(\frac{\mu_{_{GUT}}}{\mu_T}\right). \tag{14}$$

One can eliminate $\alpha_{_{GUT}}^{-1}$ from the above equations and consider the following two equations in terms of the unknown scales: μ_S, μ_T and $\mu_{_{GUT}}$:

$$\alpha_1^{-1}(\mu_Z) - \alpha_2^{-1}(\mu_Z) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(b_2^{EW} - b_1^{EW}\right)\ln\left(\frac{\mu_S}{\mu_Z}\right) + \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(b_2^S - b_1^S\right)\ln\left(\frac{\mu_T}{\mu_S}\right) + \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(b_2^T - b_1^S\right)\ln\left(\frac{\mu_{GUT}}{\mu_T}\right), \quad (15)$$

$$\alpha_2^{-1}(\mu_Z) - \alpha_3^{-1}(\mu_Z) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(b_3^{EW} - b_2^{EW}\right)\ln\left(\frac{\mu_S}{\mu_Z}\right) + \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(b_3^S - b_2^S\right)\ln\left(\frac{\mu_T}{\mu_S}\right) + \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(b_3^T - b_2^S\right)\ln\left(\frac{\mu_{GUT}}{\mu_T}\right). \quad (16)$$



FIG. 1: The running of the gauge couplings in low energy effective $SU(5)$ model with electroweak scale 2HD, TeV scale octet scalars, and intermitted scale ($\sim 10^8$ GeV) triplet scalars.

From these equations, and as shown in Fig. 1, one finds that the three gauge couplings are unified at $\mu_{GUT} = 10^{16}$ GeV if μ_s is of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV and $\mu_T \sim 10^8$ GeV. It is also worth noting that the recent CMS and ATLAS experimental results, based on searches for dijet pair signatures at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, imposed stringent constraint on the octet scalar masses: $m_S \gtrsim 2$ TeV [9].

III. OCTET SCALAR AT THE LHC

TeV scale octet scalars can be produced copiously at the LHC and lead to very interesting signatures. In the rest of the paper, we discuss the phenomenology of these scalars, in particular their production and decay in the LHC. The $SU(5)$ invariant Yukawa Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm Yuk} = Y_1 \bar{5}_\alpha 10^{\alpha\beta}(5_H^*)_\beta + Y_2 \bar{5}_\delta 10^{\alpha\beta}(45_H^*)^\delta_{\alpha\beta} + \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\lambda}\Big[Y_3 10^{\alpha\beta}10^{\gamma\delta}5_H^\lambda + Y_4 10^{\alpha\beta}10_L^{\xi\gamma}(45_H)_\xi^{\delta\lambda}\Big]. \quad (17)$$

After $SU(5)$ symmetry breaking, the interaction lagrangian of the colored octet scalars with SM fermions can be derived as [3]

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = 2(Y_2)_{ij}\bar{d}_{Ri}Q_{Lj}S^\dagger + 4\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}(Y_4^T - Y_4)_{ij}\bar{u}_{Ri}Q_{Lj}^\alpha S^\beta + h.c., \quad (18)$$

where the Yukawa couplings Y_2 and Y_4, along with the Yukawa couplings Y_1 and Y_3 of 5-plet Higgs, define the fermion masses as follows [10, 11]

$$M_E = Y_1^T v_5^* - 6Y_2^T v_{45}^*, \quad (19)$$

$$M_D = Y_1 v_5^* + 2Y_2 v_{45}^*, \quad (20)$$

$$M_U = 4(Y_3 + Y_3^T)v_5 - 8(Y_4^T - Y_4)v_{45}. \quad (21)$$

Therefore, the Yukawa coupling Y_2 can be written in terms of charged lepton and down quark masses

$$Y_2 = \frac{M_D - M_E}{8v_{45}}.$$



FIG. 2: Diagrams of the neutral octet scalar single production via gluon fusion.

However, the situation for Y_4 is more involved. It is clear that one cannot relate Y_4 directly to the up-quark masses. Moreover, in the basis where M_U is diagonal, *i.e.*, the quark mixing is emerging from down quark sector only and the rotational matrices are given by $V_L^u = V_R^u = I$ and $V_L^d = V_{CKM}$, then Y_3 and Y_4 matrices should be also diagonal, unless there is a significant fine tuning between them. In this case one finds that the couplings of up-quarks with octet scalars vanish identically. This conclusion can be also obtained if Y_4 is a symmetric matrix. Thus, the interaction Lagrangian in the physical mass basis is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^S &= \bar{d}\Big[P_L\frac{(m_D V_{CKM}^\dagger - m_E)}{4v_{45}}\Big]S^- u + \bar{u}\Big[P_R\frac{(V_{CKM}\ m_D - m_E)}{4v_{45}}\Big]S^+ d - \frac{S_R^0}{4v_{45}}\Big[\bar{d}\Big(P_L(m_E V_{CKM}) + P_R(V_{CKM}^\dagger m_E)\Big)d \\ &- m_D\bar{d}d\Big] - \frac{iS_I^0}{4v_{45}}\Big[\bar{d}\Big(P_L(m_E V_{CKM}) - P_R(V_{CKM}^\dagger m_E)\Big)d - m_D\bar{d}\gamma_5 d\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Furthermore, the gluon interaction with the octet scalars is one of their most relevant interactions with the SM particles. It is given by [3]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^S_{gluon} &= ig_s\mathrm{Tr}\Big[S^{A-}G^{\mu B}\partial_\mu S^{D+} + S_R^{A0}G^{\mu B}\partial_\mu S_R^{D0} + S_I^{A0}\ G^{\mu B}\partial_\mu S_I^{D0}\Big]\mathcal{F}^{ABD} \\ &+ g_s^2\mathrm{Tr}\Big[S^{A-}G^{\mu B}G_\mu^C S^{D+} + S_R^{A0}G^{\mu B}G_\mu^C S_R^{D0} + S_I^{A0}G^{\mu B}G_\mu^C S_I^{D0}\Big]\mathcal{F}^{ABCD} + h.c, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}^{ABD} = tr[T^A T^B T^D] = 1/4\Big(d^{ABD} + if^{ABD}\Big), \tag{24}$$

$$\mathcal{F}^{ABDE} = tr[T^A T^B T^D t^E] = \frac{2}{9}\delta^{AB}\delta^{DE} + \frac{1}{8}\Big[d^{ABC}d^{DEC} + id^{ABC}f^{DEC} + if^{ABC}d^{DEC} - f^{ABC}f^{DEC}\Big], \tag{25}$$

with d^{ABC} and f^{ABC} are the $SU(3)$ symmetric and antisymmetric structure constants, respectively.

We now consider the searches for the octet scalars at the LHC. The single neutral octet scalars can be produced at tree level from quark-anti-quark annihilation: $q\bar{q} \to S_{R,I}^0$, with $q = d, s$, and also at one loop level through the gluon fusion process: $gg \to S_{R,I}^0$, with b-quark or $S^\pm/S_{R,I}^0$ exchanges as shown in Fig.2. for $m_S \gtrsim 2$ TeV, one can safely neglect the octet scalars contributions in the loops. Thus, the gluon fusion cross section for the neutral octet scalars is given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_{LO}(gg \to S_{R,I}^0) = \sigma_0^S\ m_S^2\ \delta(\hat{s} - m_S^2), \tag{26}$$

$$\sigma_0^S = \frac{\alpha_s^2}{256\pi}\Big|\mathcal{F}^{ABC}\frac{Y_{Sb\bar{b}}}{m_b}A_{1/2}(\tau_b)\Big|^2, \tag{27}$$

where

$$A_{1/2}(\tau) = 2\Big[\tau + (\tau - 1)f(\tau)\Big]\tau^{-2}, \tag{28}$$



FIG. 3: Diagrams of the neutral and charged octet scalar pair production.

$$f(\tau) = \begin{cases} \arcsin^2\sqrt{\tau} & \tau \leq 1 \\ -\frac{1}{4}\Big[\log\frac{1+\sqrt{1-\tau^{-1}}}{1-\sqrt{1-\tau^{-1}}} - i\pi\Big]^2 & \tau > 1. \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

The color factor;

$$\sum_{ABC} \mathcal{F}^{ABC}\mathcal{F}^{ABC*} = \frac{112}{3}. \tag{30}$$

The proton- proton cross section at LO is given by:

$$\sigma(pp \to S^0_{R,I}) = x_0 \int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{dx}{x}\, f(x) f(m_S^2/sx)\, \sigma_0^S(gg \to S^0_{R,I}),$$

with $\tau = \frac{m_S^2}{4m_b^2}$, and $x_0 = m_S^2/s$. The charged octet scalars are singly produced at tree level only from $q\bar{q'} \to S^{\pm}$, with $q = u, d$ or s. While the pair productions of the neutral and charged octet scalars occur at tree level is shown in Fig.3. The cross section of the partonic pair production of octet scalars is given by [12]

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt}(gg \to SS) = \frac{\pi\alpha_s^2}{s^2}\Big(\frac{27}{32} + \frac{9(u-t)^2}{32s^2}\Big)\Big(1 + \frac{2m_s^2}{u-m_s^2} + \frac{2m_s^2}{t-m_s^2}\Big) + \frac{2m_s^4}{(u-m_s^2)^2} + \frac{2m_s^4}{(t-m_s^2)^2} + \frac{4m_s^4}{(t-m_s^2)(u-m_s^2)}, \tag{31}$$

which implies that

$$\sigma(gg \to\ SS) \ =\ \frac{\pi\alpha_s^2}{s}\Big(\frac{15k}{16} + \frac{51km_s^2}{8s} + \frac{9m_s^2}{2s^2}(s-m_s^2)\ \ln\big(\frac{1-k}{1+k}\big)\Big), \tag{32}$$

where $k = (1 - \frac{4m_s^2}{s})^{1/2}$. Note that the initial kinematics threshold of this process is given by $s = 4m_S^2$. We have used Feynrules [13] to generate the model files and MadEvent5 [14] to calculate the numerical values of the cross sections of neutral and charged octet scalar. We assume $\sqrt{s} = 14\ TeV$. In Fig. 4 we show different cross sections of single and pair productions of neutral and charged octet scalars in terms of universal octet scalar mass. As can be seen from this figure that for octet scalar mass of order $\mathcal{O}(2)$ TeV, the single production cross section is about one order of magnitude larger than the pair production cross sections. This result is consistent with the findings in other extensions of the SM with heavy octet scalars [15, 16]. Therefore, one may expect that the single production of octet scalar at the LHC would have a higher possibility.

In our model, the neutral scalars decay dominantly into $b\bar{b}$, while the charged octet scalars decay into $b\bar{t}$ or $t\bar{b}$. If $m_{S^0} > m_{S^{\pm}}$, then one may consider the decay channel: $S^0 \to S^{\pm}\, W^{\mp}$. Recall that the octet scalar interactions with



FIG. 4: The hadronic production cross sections of $q\bar{q} \to S^0_{R,I}$, $q\bar{q}' \to S^{\pm}$, gluonic fusion ($gg \to S^0_{R,I}$), and the pair production $pp \to S^{0/\pm} S^{0/\mp}$ as a function of m_S at CME $\sqrt{s} = 14\ TeV$.

electroweak gauge bosons are obtained from the kinetic term of 45_H[3]: $\mathrm{Tr}\big[(D_\mu 45_H)^\dagger (D^\mu 45_H)\big]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= -\frac{im_z}{v} S^- A^\mu \partial_\mu S^+ + \frac{ig}{\sqrt{2}} S^- W^{\mu+} \partial_\mu S^0 - \frac{ig}{\sqrt{2}} S^0 W^{\mu-} \partial_\mu S^+ + \frac{im_z}{v} S^0 Z^\mu \partial_\mu S^0 \\
&- 1/4\Big[\frac{m_z^2}{v^2} S^- A^\mu A_\mu S^+ - 2\sqrt{2}\frac{gm_z}{\nu} S^- A^\mu W^+_\mu S^0 - 2g^2 S^- W^{\mu+} W^-_\mu S^+ + 2\sqrt{2}\frac{gm_z}{v} S^- W^{\mu+} Z_\mu S^0 \\
&- 2\sqrt{2}\frac{gm_z}{v} S^0 W^{\mu-} Z_\mu S^+ - 2g^2 S^0 W^{\mu-} W^+_\mu S^0 + 2\sqrt{2}\frac{gm_z}{v} S^0 Z^\mu W^-_\mu S^+ - 4\frac{m_z^2}{v^2} S^0 Z^\mu Z_\mu S^0\Big]. \qquad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

It is important to mention that phenomenological analyses of octet scalars has been recently studied in literature [16]. However, most of these analysis were based on the octet scalars given in Manohar-Wise model [17], where the octet scalars have free coupling with SM up and down quarks as well as the SM gauge bosons. Here our octet scalars interactions are limited to the effective non-minimal $SU(5)$ model as explained in detail in Ref.[3]. Moreover, we also impose the stringent experimental constraint that neutral/charged octet scalars mass ~ 2 TeV, which is consistent with our conclusions of the previous section for having a gauge coupling unification at scale larger than 10^{15} GeV.

As advocated above, the process $pp \to S^0 \to b\bar{b}$ has a large cross section, however, it turns out that the SM background of this process exceeds any possible signature even if one applies a large P_T cuts on the outgoing jets. In Fig. 5 (left panel) we plot the number of reconstructed events per bin of the invariant mass of $b\bar{b}$ of this process for S signal and SM background at P_T cut > 800 GeV with $m_{S^0} = 2$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV. This figure shows that it is not possible to extract a good significance for the octet signal in this channel. In addition, we also consider the process: $pp \to S^0 \to S^+ W^- \to t\ \bar{b}\ W^- \to 2l + 2b +$ missing energy. This process has a small cross section in SM, hence applying small cuts on the jets final states suppresses the SM background. Nevertheless, these cuts also suppress our signal. Therefore, as can be seen from Fig.5 (right panel), one cannot get a good significance for S signal for this channel as well.

We now turn to possible signals from the pair production processes. Although, these processes have smaller cross sections, one finds that by imposing suitable cuts a significant signal can be obtained. In Fig. 6 (left panel) we plot the number of events of $pp \to S^0 S^0 \to b\ \bar{b}\ b\ \bar{b}$ per bin at the parton level at 14 TeV center of mass energy versus the invariant mass of the $b\bar{b}$ pair without applying any cuts on the outgoing b−jets. While in Fig. 6 (right panel), we present the partonic center of mass energy of the process $pp \to S^+ S^- \to b\ \bar{t}\ t\ \bar{b}, (\bar{t} \to W^-\ \bar{b}), (t \to W^+ b)$, with the possibility that W boson decays leptonacilly into $l\nu$ (30 %) or hadronically into $q\ \bar{q}$ (70 %). So the following three modes are available: (a) $(W^- \to l^-\bar{\nu}), (W^+ \to q\bar{q}')$ with final states, $l + 2(b\bar{b})+$ 2 jets + missing energy, (b) $(W^- \to l^-\bar{\nu}), (W^+ \to l^+\nu)$ with final states, $2l + 2(b\bar{b})$ + missing energy and (c) $(W^- \to q\bar{q}'), (W^+ \to q\ \bar{q}')$. Also we



FIG. 5: The number of reconstructed events per bin of the invariant mass of a jet- pair for the S^0 signal and the SM background at $P_T > 800$ GeV, $m_{S^0} = 2$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV for (Left panel) $pp \to S^0 \to b\bar{b}$ and for (Right panel) $pp \to S^0 \to W^- S^+ \to l^- l^+ b\bar{b}\nu\bar{\nu}$. Here the bin size is 30 GeV.

didn't impose any cuts on the final states in this plot.



FIG. 6: (Left panel) The number of events per bin of the invarinat mass of $b\bar{b}$ pair in $pp \to S^0 S^0 \to b\ \bar{b}\ b\ \bar{b}$ process at $\sqrt{s} = 14TeV$. (Right panel)The partonic center of mass energy for $pp \to S^+ S^- \to b\ \bar{t}\ t\ \bar{b}$ (Left panel) and $pp \to S^0 \to S^+\ W^-$ (Right panel) according to the decay chains (a),(b) and (c) for each channel as declared in the text. The size of the bin is 30 GeV and both plots are presented without applying any cuts on the outgoing final states.

From these figures, it is clear that the $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$ final state channel gives the best signal for probing the neutral octet scalar at the LHC. To investigate the $4b$-tagged jets, a strong cut should be imposed to suppress the SM background. We apply cut on the transverse momentum P_T of the produced 4-jets to be $P_T > 800$ GeV. This is an acceptable cut, since we expect high energitic jets produced by the octet scalars. This cut enhances the signifcance $S = N_{signal}/\sqrt{N_{background}}$, where σ_{SM} becomes $3.967\times10^{-4}\ fb$ and $\sigma_S = 1.827\times10^{-3}\ fb$. Decreasing the P_T cut to > 700 GeV implies a reduction in the significance of our signal, since σ_{SM} becomes $1.66\times10^{-3}\ fb$ and $\sigma_S = 3.954\times10^{-3}\ fb$. In Fig. 7 we display the number of reconstructed events per bin of the invariant mass of b−jet pair in $pp \to S^0 S^0 \to b\ \bar{b}\ b\ \bar{b}$ process and the SM background after applying highest P_T cut, $P_T > 800$ GeV at 14 TeV center of mass energy. Here we use pythia and PGS detector simulator for the octet scalars signal and SM background at integrated luminosity $200 fb^{-1}$ and $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV [18]. For jet clustering algorithm, cone algorithm with radius parameter $R = 0.5$ has been used. We also used MadAnalysis5 [19] to plot our results.

In Table I we provide some details for the used cut on P_T and E_T on signal and background for the process $pp \to S^0 \to W^- S^+ \to l^- l^+ b\bar{b}\nu\bar{\nu}$. As can be seen from the results in this table, the signal of this process is always smaller than the background. It is worth mentioning that we have tried other cuts like pseudo-rapidity, η, and we



FIG. 7: The number of reconstructed events per bin of the invariant mass of a jet- pair for the S^0 signal and the SM background for $pp \to S^0 S^0 \to b\,\bar{b}\,b\,\bar{b}$ process at $P_T > 800$ GeV, $m_{S^0} = 2$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV. The bin size is 30 GeV .

find that similar to P_T and E_T the signal remains less than the background.

$P_T$min. [GeV]	$E_T$min. [GeV]	σ_S $[fb]$	$\sigma_{SM}[fb]$
800	0	1.37×10^{-4}	8.3×10^{-2}
600	300	3.9×10^{-4}	6.8×10^{-2}
800	400	4.4×10^{-5}	6.9×10^{-3}
200	400	2.1×10^{-3}	0.88

TABLE I: Different cross sections for $pp \to S^0 \to W^- S^+ \to l^- l^+ b\bar{b}\nu\bar{\nu}$ process and the SM background for different cuts applied on the transverse momentum P_T and the missing energy E_T at $m_{S^0} = 2$ TeV and CME=14 TeV.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have studied some phenomenological aspects of the non-minimal $SU(5)$ model. We emphasized that the low energy Higgs sector of this class of models consists of two SM-like Higgs doublets, two neutral and one charged octet scalars, in addition to two triplets colored scalars. We have shown that the gauge coupling unification could be realized at 10^{16} GeV, if the octet scalar masses are of order TeV and the triplet scalar masses are of order an intermediate scale $\sim 10^8$ GeV. We have also analyzed the possible LHC signatures of these TeV octet scalars. We showed that they can be singly produced at tree level from $q\bar{q}$ annihilation (neutral octet scalar) or $q\bar{q}'$ annihilation (charged octet scalar) and in pairs through the process $gg \to S^{0(\pm)} S^{0(\mp)}$. We found that the process $pp \to S^0 \to b\bar{b}$ has the largest cross section, however the SM background is quite large and exceeds any possible signature even if one applies a large P_T cut on the outgoing jets. We argued that applying a high P_T cut of the order $\gtrsim 800$ GeV on the outgoing jets, the best channel which can provide a good signal for our heavy octet scalars is the $4b$-tagged jets final states. Although the other channels of multi-jets with associated leptons and missing energy have significant cross sections, they can not lead to good significance due to the high p_T cut that one should implement in order to suppress the SM background.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank I. Dorŝner for his useful comments about the previous version. S.S. would like thank Ahmed Ali, Celine Degrande, Olivier Mattelaer, Peter Skands, Benjamin Fuks and Rikkert Frederix for their useful help and discussions.

---

[1] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 438 (1974); H. Georgi, HUTP-79/A058; H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B **156**, 126 (1979);

[2] P. H. Frampton, S. Nandi and J. J. G. Scanio, Phys. Lett. B **85**, 225 (1979);A. Giveon, L. J. Hall and U. Sarid, Phys. Lett. B **271**, 138 (1991);P. H. Frampton, Phys. Lett. B **89**, 352 (1980); J. R. Ellis and M. K. Gaillard, Phys. Lett. B **88**, 315 (1979).

[3] S. Khalil and S. Salem, Nucl. Phys. B **876**, 473 (2013) [arXiv:1304.3689 [hep-ph]].

[4] Pavel Fileviez Pèrez, Ryan Gavin, Thomas McElmurry, Frank Petriello. Phys.Rev. D **78**.115017(2008), hep-ph/0809.2106v2; P. Fileviez Pèrez, Hoernisa Iminniyaz and Germán Rodrigo. Phys.Rev.D**78**.015013(2008), hep-ph/0803.4156v2;
Pavel Fileviez Pèrez. In *Karlsruhe 2007, SUSY 2007* 678-681, [arXiv:0710.1321 [hep-ph]].

[5] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. B **105**, 267 (1981); S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **117**, 287 (1982); G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **324**, 59 (1994); H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **108**, 283 (1982); A. Masiero, D. V. Nanopoulos, K. Tamvakis and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **115**, 380 (1982); B. Grinstein, Nucl. Phys. B **206**, 387 (1982); Z. Berezhiani, C. Csaki and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B **444**, 61 (1995) [hep-ph/9501336]; T. Yamashita, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 115016 (2011) [arXiv:1106.3229 [hep-ph]].

[6] P. Fileviez Pèrez. Phys.Lett. B **595**, 476(2004), hep-ph/0403286; Ilja Dorŝner, vjetlana Fajfer, Nejc Kosnik. Phys.Rev. D **86**.015013(2012), hep-ph/1204.0674; Eugenio Del Nobile, Roberto Franceschini, Duccio Pappadopulo, Alessandro Strumia. Nucl.Phys. B **826**. (2010) 217-234, hep-ph/0908.1567.

[7] P. Fileviez Pèrez. Phys.Lett. B **595**, 476(2004), hep-ph/0403286; Ilja Dorŝner, vjetlana Fajfer, Nejc Kosnik. Phys.Rev. D **86**.015013(2012), hep-ph/1204.0674; Eugenio Del Nobile, Roberto Franceschini, Duccio Pappadopulo, Alessandro Strumia. Nucl.Phys. B **826**. (2010) 217-234, hep-ph/0908.1567.

[8] U. Amaldi, W. deBoer and H. Fürstenau, Phys. Lett. B **260** (1991) 447; W. J. Marciano, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. **41** (1991) 469.

[9] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2263 (2013) arXiv:1210.4826.
see also G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1828 (2011) arXiv:1110.2693.

[10] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, Phys. Lett. B **86**, 297 (1979). Ilja Dorŝner and P. Fileviez Pèrez, Phys. Lett. B **642**, 248 (2006), hep-ph/0606062.

[11] S. Nandi and K. Tanaka, Phys. Lett. B **92**, 107 (1980).

[12] S.I. Bityukov ,N.V.Krasnikov, CMS Note 1997/067.

[13] Adam. Alloul, Neil D. Christensen, Cèline Degrande, Claude Duhrd, Benjamin Fuks, arXiv: 1310.1921v1 [hep-ph].

[14] J.Alwall, M. Herquet , F. Maltoni , O. Mattelaer , T. Stelzer, arXiv: 1106.0522v1 [hep-ph].

[15] Pavel Fileviez Pérez.Ryan Gavin.Thomas McElmurry and Frank Petriello. (2008), hep-ph/0809.2106v2; M. I. Gresham and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 075003 [arXiv:0706.0909 [hep-ph]].

[16] Jonathan M. Arnold, Bartosz Fornal, Phys.Rev.D **85**,055020(2011), hep-ph/1112.0003; S. I. Bityukov and N. V. Krasnikov, Mod.Phys.Lett.A**12**, 2011 (1997), hep-ph/9705338; Y. Bai and B. A. Dobrescu, JHEP **1107**, 100 (2011) [arXiv:1012.5814 [hep-ph]];M. Gerbush, T. J. Khoo, D. J. Phalen, A. Pierce and D. Tucker-Smith, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 095003 (2008) [arXiv:0710.3133 [hep-ph]]; X. -G. He, G. Valencia and H. Yokoya, JHEP **1112**, 030 (2011) [arXiv:1110.2588 [hep-ph]]; A. Idilbi, C. Kim and T. Mehen, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 075017 (2010) [arXiv:1007.0865 [hep-ph]]; G. Z. Krnjaic, FERMILAB-THESIS-2012-34; C. Kim and T. Mehen, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 035011 (2009) [arXiv:0812.0307 [hep-ph]].

[17] A. V. Manohar, M. B. Wise, Phys.Rev.D**74**,035009(2006).

[18] https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/HigProjectionEsg2012TWiki

[19] Eric Contea , Benjamin Fuksb , Guillaume Serretb, arXiv: 1206.1599v2 [hep-ph].